(c) *cinnabarinus* Boisduval, 1866, as published in the combination *Acarus cinnabarinus* (*Essai sur l'Entomologie horticole* etc., page 88, 1866) according to the redescription of Boudreaux (*Ann. ent. Soc. America* **49** : 46, 1956). As neotype the specimen indicated by Boudreaux & Dosse (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 365, 21 Oct. 1963) under the name *Acarus telarius* (B.M.(N.H.)) 1963.1.9.1. might be available.

14. I furthermore propose to the International Commission to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the following names:

(a) *alceae* De la Chenaye des Bois, 1759, as published in the combination *Acarus alceae* (*Dictionn. raisonné et Universal des Animaux* **1** : 647, 1759). De la Chenaye des Bois copied this name from Linnaeus' *Fauna Svecica*, 1746, (ed. 1) : 347, which is not entirely binominal. If this name is considered valid because De la Chenaye des Bois gives a description, it is recommended to be rejected, as it might be an older synonym of *Tetranychus urtica* C. L. Koch, 1836.

(b) *sambuci* Schrank, 1781, as published in the combination *Acarus sambuci* (*Enumeratio Insectorum Austriae*, p. 524, 1781). This species is often considered as an older synonym of *Tetranychus urticae* C. L. Koch, 1836. The solution of this problem is not yet definite, but the two species are closely related. If they prove to be synonymic, it is preferable to reject the older name *sambuci* as at present. If they are not synonymic, the mite of *Sambucus* can be renamed later.

(c) *textor* Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the combination *Acarus textor* (*Entomologia parisiensis* **2** : 530, 1785). Notwithstanding the short description this animal can be considered as a senior synonym of *Tetranychus tiliarium* (Joh. Hermann, 1804) (Boudreaux & Dosse, 1963, in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 365, 11b), but it would be a junior synonym of *Acarus telarius* Linnaeus, 1758 sensu Van Eyndhoven (in this paper). The diagnosis of *Acarus textor* has been copied from Geoffroy (1762, *Hist. abr. Ins.* **2** : 626–627), who gave no binominal name.

(d) *tiliae* Forskål, 1787, as published in the combination *Acarus tiliae* (Hospita Insectorum Flora, 1787, *in* Linnaeus, *Amoen. Acad.* **3** : 296). Although this name is a junior synonym of *Acarus telarius* Linnaeus, 1758 sensu Van Eyndhoven (in this paper), it is to be considered as a senior synonym of *Trombidium tiliarium* (Joh. Hermann, 1804) (Boudreaux & Dosse in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 365, 11b).

(e) *alceae* Forskål, 1787, as published in the combination *Acarus alceae* (Hospita Insectorum Flora, 1787, *in* Linnaeus, *Amoen. Acad.* **3** : 299. This is important in case the name *alceae* of De la Chenaye des Bois, 1759 (see this paragraph under " a ") is not rejected.

(f) *tiliarium* Joh. Hermann, 1804, as published in the combination *Trombidium tiliarium* (*Mém. Apt.*, page 42–43). Although this name will become a junior synonym of *Acarus telarius* Linnaeus, 1758, sensu Van Eyndhoven (in this paper), it is better to place it on the Official Index, as the description of Joh. Hermann is not restricted to *Tilia*, but refers to other plants as well. It could thus be considered as a junior synonym of *Tetranychus urticae* C. L. Koch, 1836 (see paragraph 12b in this paper and Boudreaux & Dosse, 1963, in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 365–366).

COMMENT ON THE COUNTERPROPOSALS OF G. L. VAN EYNDHOVEN RELATIVE TO THE VALIDATION OF ACARINE NAMES. Z.N.(S.) 1564.

By H. B. Boudreaux (*Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge*)

It was because of the widely differing interpretations of intent attributed to Linnaeus that our proposal for stabilization of the names of important species of spinning mites was constructed (Boudreaux and Dosse, 1963, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 365–366, 21 Oct.). If I disagree with Prof. van Eyndhoven, it is largely in the interpretations of the works of the early writers.

I want to comment on some of our differences, with reference to Eyndhoven's comments above. It seems to me that his selection of a lectotype from a non-existent series of " syntypes " is invalid, because by its very selection a lectotype must be represented by a specimen or figure that can be studied. As far as is known there are no extant Linnaean types of mites.

In every early account of *Acarus telarius* Linnaeus, 1758, that I can find, various authors confuse the Linden mite with other spinning mites in the same fashion that Linnaeus did in *Systema Naturae* Ed. 10, and not until 1804 was the Linden mite distinguished from other mites *by name and in unmistakable fashion*, when Johann Hermann proposed its name in a note inserted in the book written by his son, J. F. Hermann, 1804, *Memoire Apterologique:* 41–42. The name *Trombidium tiliarium* then must be credited to the *father*, Joh. Hermann. The *son*, J. F. Hermann, used the name (op. cit: 42–43) for at least three species which were confused, but the son's description was written *before* the father's validation of the name *Trombidium tiliarium* for the Linden mite. The claim that Rydbeck, 1758, *Pandora Insectorum*, restricted the name *telarius* to the mite usually found on Linden is unacceptable, because Rydbeck specifically points out that his use of *Acarus telarius* is in the sense of the confused description of *Systema Naturae.*

Without the direct testimony of Linnaeus, the species included in his original *Acarus telarius* will never be certainly known. In spite of the testimony of Eyndhoven (above), the inclusion of a host plant citation cannot certainly identify the mites in question, and can only be suggestive. *Eotetranychus tiliarium* (Joh. Hermann, 1804) *sensu* Boudreaux and Dosse has been recorded on hosts other than *Tilia*. The other two mites are known to be highly polyphagous, and one occasionally infests *Tilia.* Therefore instead of trying to interpret the confused statements of the early writers, I feel that we must use names as they were first definitely established. Although Eyndhoven states that the carmine mite (*Tetranychus telarius* (L.) 1758, (sensu Boudreaux and Dosse) is perhaps completely lacking outdoors and not very common in greenhouses, there is evidence to the contrary in the European literature, and the firsthand experiences of Dosse confirm this. There is no question that Koch established the name *T. urticae* (1836, *Deutsche Crust. Myr. Arach.* fasc. **1** : 10) for the common two-spotted mite in an unmistakable fashion, for the first time. I believe from the evidence we have found that the carmine mite was also included in the Linnaean " A. telarius ". There are so many old references to " red spiders " in the sense of the Linnaean " A. telarius " that it is hardly thinkable that the carmine mite was not common at the time of Linnaeus, but it was confused with the orange or yellow fall colour of diapausing mites. Therefore the carmine mite was the last to remain after Joh. Hermann removed *Tr. tiliarium*, and Koch removed *T. urticae.*

The establishment of a lot of confusion, as claimed by Eyndhoven, will not be avoided by his proposals. Until rather recently the name *Tetranychus telarius* was used everywhere *except in Europe* for both the two-spotted mite and the carmine mite. Eyndhoven refers to acarologists especially outside of Europe as " only part of the acarologists ". I submit that his version would cause even more confusion, because " acarologists outside of Europe " out number those in Europe.

Concerning Eyndhoven's proposed rejected names (op. cit., Paragraph 14), *alceae* de la Chenaye des Bois, 1859 (*Dictionn. rais. Univ. Anim.* **1** : 647) cannot be an available name because the author is not binomial in other parts of his work. I agree that *sambuci* Schrank, 1781 (*Enum. Insect. Aust.* p. 524) should be suppressed, for the reasons given by Eyndhoven. The same is true for *textor* Fourcroy, 1785 (*Ent. Paris.* **2** : 530) because both the latter species cannot be identified. The names *tiliae* Forskål, 1787 and *alceae* Forskål, 1787 are improperly cited as 1787. Forskål's work was first published as a dissertation in 1752. This was reprinted several times, and such reprinting does not make a name available, so these names are not available as credited to Forskål.

Finally Eyndhoven (Par. 14, f.) mentions *tiliarium* Joh. Hermann, 1804 (*Mem. Apt*. 42–43). This name was used not by Joh. Hermann (père), but by J. F. Hermann (fils) in a confused sense *before* Joh. Hermann wrote his note restricting the name *tiliarium* to the linden mite. Thus it is the name *tiliarium* J. F. Hermann (fils) 1804, which must be suppressed in the sense of Eyndhoven, and not *tiliarium* Joh. Hermann (père), 1804. The name proposed by the father appears in the inserted note on pp. 41–42, and clearly must be credited to the father.

Please see the full discussion of our path of reasoning in: Boudreaux and Dosse, 1963. Concerning the names of some common spider mites in: *Recent Advances in Acarology* **1** : 350–364. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, New York, U.S.A.

OBJECTION TO, AND REVISION OF, THE PROPOSAL RELATING TO *KROHNIA* LANGERHANS, 1880 (CHAETOGNATHA). Z.N.(S.) 1586

(see volume 20, pages 381–382)

By Norman Tebble (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

With reference to the application by R. Alvarado and I. Moreno (Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, Madrid, Spain) for the validation of *Krohnia* Langerhans, 1880 Chaetognatha, under the plenary powers, I wish to register a firm objection.

The genus *Krohnia* Quatrefages, 1865, with type-species *Alciopa lepidota* Krohn, 1845, is a valid taxon. It is a recognised species of pelagic polychaete widely distributed in Tropical and Sub-Tropical waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. As *Krohnia lepidota* (Krohn, 1845) it has been reported as a good species by Støp-Bowitz (1948), Dales (1957), Hartman (1959), Tebble (1960, 1962).

Fauvel (1923) was in error in rejecting *Krohnia* for *Callizonella* Apstein, (1891), which is a synonym of it.

References

Fauvel, P. 1923. Polychètes errantes. *Faune de France*, Paris **5** : 1–488, 181 text-figs.

Stop-Bowitz, C. 1948. Polychaeta from the " Michael Sars " North Atlantic Deep-Sea Exped. 1910. *Rep. Sars N. Atl. Deep-Sea Exped.* **5**(8) : 1–91, 51 figs.

Dales, R. P. 1957. Pelagic polychaetes of the Pacific Ocean. *Bull. Scripps Inst. Oceanogr.* **7** : 99–167, 64 figs.

Hartman, O. 1959. Allan Hancock Foundation Publications No. 23, *Catalogue of the Polychaetous Annelids of the World*

Tebble, N. 1960. The distribution of pelagic polychaetes in the South Atlantic Ocean. " *Discovery* " *Report* **30** : 161–300, 52 figs.

—— 1962. The distribution of pelagic polychaetes across the North Pacific Ocean. *Bull. Brit. Mus.* (*nat. Hist.*) *Zool.* **7**(9) : 371–492

By R. Alvarado and I. Moreno (*Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, Madrid, Spain*)

In view of the fact that *Krohnia* is now in use in Polychaeta, as Dr. Tebble (in a letter dated 8 Nov. 1963) has pointed out, we have considered the proposal submitted and published (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **20** : 381–382) as a case included under the Code (Arts. 53, 60 and 67(i)).

Considering the literature concerned with both the nominal genera *Eukrohnia* and *Krohnia* we have modified our first proposal and the new one is submitted as follows:

The International Commission is requested:

(1) to place the generic name *Eukrohnia* Ritter-Zahony, 1909 (gender : feminine), type-species by original designation, *Sagitta hamata* Möbius, 1875, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(2) to place the specific name *hamata* Möbius, 1875, as published in the binomen *Sagitta hamata* (type-species of *Eukrohnia* Ritter-Zahony, 1909) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the generic name *Krohnia* Langerhans, 1880 (a junior homonym of *Krohnia* Quatrefages, 1865) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.